DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 467 677 EA 031 834

TITLE	Education Funding for Residential Facilities.
INSTITUTION	Ohio State Legislative Office of Education Oversight, Columbus.
PUB DATE	2002-02-00
NOTE	54p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Legislative Office of Education Oversight, 77 South High Street, 15th Floor, Columbus, OH 43266-0927. Tel: 614-752-9686; Fax: 614-752-3058. For full text: http://www.loeo.state.oh.us.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; Government Publications; Residential Programs; *Residential Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*Ohio

ABSTRACT

About 167 residential facilities in Ohio serve approximately 7,000 youth on any given day. Youth are placed in residential facilities because they have committed a crime or have behavioral problems. An "education provider" operates an on-grounds school in most facilities. Because of ongoing concerns about education funding for youth in these facilities, the Legislative Committee on Education Oversight asked the Legislative Office of Education Oversight to conduct a study of the issue. Research shows that there is no "system" for funding education programs in residential facilities. The amount of funding education providers receive varies widely because they have access to different sources of state and local funding. The education programs in over 100 facilities are not required to follow any education standards. Recommendations include evaluating the Private Treatment Facility Pilot Project, developed in 1993, to determine its effectiveness and whether its funding and monitoring processes should apply to all residential facilities in Ohio, convening a task force to recommend a new education funding system, and improving communication between residential facilities and the Ohio Department of Education. Appendices contain a descriptive list of residential facilities, a map showing their locations, and education program criteria for private residential treatment facilities. (RT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

EA

Education Funding for Residential Facilities

ED 467 677

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
N. C. ZALANO
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

EA 031834

LEGISLATIVE OFFICE OF EDUCATION OVERSIGHT
Columbus, Ohio
February 2002

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LEGISLATIVE OFFICE OF EDUCATION OVERSIGHT
77 South High Street, 15th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215
Phone (614) 752-9686 Fax (614) 752-3058
Web Site: http://www.loeo.state.oh.us

REPRESENTATIVES

Merle Grace Kearns, Chair
Jamie Callender
Kevin DeWine
William Hartnett
Claudette Woodard

SENATORS

Linda J. Furney
Randall L. Gardner
Robert A. Gardner
Bill Harris
Michael C. Shoemaker

DIRECTOR

Nancy C. Zajano, Ph.D.

CHIEF OF RESEARCH

Lindsey L. Ladd

RESEARCH STAFF

Susan Campbell, Ph.D., Project Manager

ASSISTED BY

Kristine Leggett

FORMAT EDITOR

Molly Peacock

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

Donna Robinson

The Legislative Office of Education Oversight (LOEO) serves as staff to the Legislative Committee on Education Oversight. Created by the Ohio General Assembly in 1989, the Office evaluates education-related activities funded by the state of Ohio. This LOEO report describes the funding available for education services to students in residential facilities. *Conclusions and recommendations in this report are those of the LOEO staff and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Committee or its members.*

This report is available at LOEO's web site: http://www.loeo.state.oh.us

Summary

Education Funding for Residential Facilities

Background

LOEO estimates that 167 residential facilities in Ohio serve about 7,000 youth on any given day.

The Legislative Office of Education Oversight (LOEO) estimates that 167 residential facilities in Ohio serve approximately 7,000 youth on any given day. These facilities provide supervision and services to ten or more youth 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Youth are placed in residential facilities because they have committed a crime or have behavioral problems resulting from abuse, neglect, addiction, or mental illness. Most facilities work with an "education provider" to offer an education program on their premises because many of these students are unable to attend nearby public schools.

In most facilities, an "education provider" operates an on-grounds school.

Of the 167 facilities, 53% are public, operated by the Ohio Department of Youth Services (DYS) and county DYS and social service agencies. The remaining facilities are considered "private," operated by non-profit organizations and for-profit companies.

Because of ongoing concerns about education funding for youth in residential facilities, the Legislative Committee on Education Oversight asked LOEO to conduct a study of the issue. LOEO was not able to determine the *amount* of funding needed to educate youth in facilities because state agencies do not collect the necessary data.

This LOEO report describes the different education providers, the sources of funding available to each, and the factors that affect the amount and flow of public education funding to these providers.

Education Providers and Sources of Education Funding

The amount of funding education providers receive varies widely because they have access to different sources of state and local funding.

LOEO found that there is no "system" for funding the education programs in residential facilities. The amount of education funding depends on the type of provider. Providers have access to different *sources* of state and local funding.

Thus, different providers serving the *same* student would receive a different *amount* of funding for that student.

There are six types of education providers serving residential facilities:

- School districts;
- Residential facilities themselves;
- Educational Service Centers (ESCs);
- Chartered, non-public schools;
- The DYS school district; and
- Community schools.

In LOEO's example, the amount that providers receive for regular education students ranges from zero to $7,438 per pupil. For special education students, the amount varies from zero to $17,499. Residential facilities that provide education services themselves receive no state or local education funding.

Private Treatment Facility Pilot Project

A total of five facilities have benefited from participation in the Private Treatment Facility Pilot Project since its inception.

A 1993 task force outlined minimum education standards for residential facilities and estimated the cost of educating youth in facilities to be $20-30 million a year. The General Assembly rejected this proposal as too costly and developed the Private Treatment Facility Pilot Project instead.

In 1997, Amended Substitute House Bill 215 of the 122nd General Assembly created the pilot project and funded it with a $1 million set-aside each fiscal year. Five of the 167 residential facilities have participated in the pilot project since its inception.

Pilot project education providers receive more state funding than other providers and assistance from ODE in getting local education funding from students' districts of residence.

Additional Factors Influencing Funding to Education Providers

In addition to funding variations resulting from being served by different providers, LOEO also learned that the amount of public education funding depends on two ad hoc factors:

Various ad hoc factors affect the amount and flow of education funding.

- Whether the student was included in the Average Daily Membership (ADM) of any school district; and
- When students enter a facility and how long they stay.

Factors that *hinder* the flow of state and local funding include:

- Incomplete or missing school records that make identifying the students' district of residence difficult or impossible;
- A lack of "up-front" funds to pay for education services;
- Confusion and disagreement about the state and local funding received for facility students;
- Complex billing procedures; and
- Differences in the district responsible for tuition payment when the parent's district of residence is unknown.

Factors that *help* the flow of education funding to providers include juvenile court judges noting a district of residence for students and providers devoting staff resources to identifying the district of residence.

Monitoring of Education Standards

The education programs in over 100 facilities are not required to follow any education standards.

LOEO discovered that over 100 facilities are not required to follow any education standards and are not monitored. Only the education programs in the five pilot project facilities, the 11 state DYS facilities, and a limited number of county DYS facilities are held accountable using education standards.

Recommendations

Evaluation of the pilot project

LOEO concludes that there is no "system" for funding education programs in residential facilities. The Private Treatment Facility Pilot Project uses a funding mechanism that its developers had hoped would expand to all facilities in Ohio. The Ohio Department of Education (ODE), however, has not completed an overall evaluation of the effectiveness of the pilot project.

Therefore, LOEO recommends that the Ohio Department of Education:

- Evaluate the pilot project to determine its effectiveness and whether its funding and monitoring processes should apply to all residential facilities in Ohio.

- Inform the task force that is described below about what has been learned from the pilot project funding process and the use of education standards that might benefit all residential facilities.

Task force on education funding for youth in residential facilities

LOEO learned that no unified list of residential facilities in Ohio exists. State licensing agencies maintain their own separate lists. These lists do not include essential data that would allow a determination of the cost of educating facility youth.

Therefore, LOEO recommends that the Ohio General Assembly:

- Require that ODE convene a task force to recommend a new education funding system for youth in residential facilities. This task force should include representatives from state agencies that license or operate facilities, as well as organizations and individuals that place youth in facilities.

- Require the task force to:

  - Develop a unified database of all residential facilities serving youth in Ohio and determine who should maintain the database. The database should include information that would allow the cost of educating facility youth to be determined, including who provides education services and the number of days of instruction each student receives;

  - Determine what revenue and expenditure data to include in the unified database;

  - Determine what funding mechanism would be best for the highly mobile residential facility student population;

  - Recommend that the General Assembly discontinue funding the pilot project after a new funding mechanism is in place; and

  - Consider whether education standards should be added to licensure requirements.

Improving communication

LOEO found that some private residential facility administrators seem unaware of the options available for providing education programs to students in their facilities. Also, some district treasurers are unaware that Ohio law allows them to include facility students in their ADM. In addition, in fiscal year 2001 only two juvenile courts in Ohio took advantage of a $425,000 set-aside that can be used to help defray the costs of educating youth placed in private residential facilities.

LOEO recommends the Ohio Department of Education:

- Designate a contact person within ODE to offer information on the options available for providing education services to youth in residential facilities.

- Be proactive in explaining the public education funding available to providers and how it can be obtained.

- Identify ways to notify juvenile courts about the $425,000 set-aside.

Funding for Residential Facilities

Table of Contents

I. Introduction 1
- **Background** 1
  - Types of residential facilities 1
  - Youth served by residential facilities 2
  - Private Treatment Facility Pilot Project 3
  - Education standards 4
- **LOEO Study** 5
  - Impetus for study 5
  - Lack of data 5
  - Study questions 5
  - Study methods 6
  - Report organization 6

II. Education Providers and Sources of Education Funding 7
- **School Funding Definitions** 7
- **Education Providers** 11
  - School districts 12
  - Facilities as education providers 13
  - Educational Service Centers 14
  - Chartered, non-public schools 14
  - The Department of Youth Services school district 14
  - Private Treatment Facility Pilot Project 16
  - Community schools 17
- **Comparing the Amount of Funding across Education Providers** 18
- **Other Sources of Funding** 20
- **Monitoring of Education Standards** 21
- **Summary** 21

III. Additional Factors Influencing Funding to Education Providers 23
- **Factors Affecting the Actual Amount of Funding** 23
  - Residential facility students not included in provider ADM 23
  - Student mobility 23
- **Factors that Hinder the Flow of Education Funding** 24
  - Incomplete or missing school records 24
  - "After-the-fact" vs. "up-front" funding 25
  - Confusion about ODE's disbursement of funds 25
  - Complexities of billing 25
  - Who pays? 26
- **Factors that Help the Flow of Education Funding** 26
  - Juvenile courts noting school district of residence 26
  - Staff resources dedicated to securing funding 26

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations 28
Summary 28
The Private Treatment Facility Pilot Project 29
Education standards 29
Conclusions and Recommendations 30
Evaluation of the pilot project 30
Task force on education funding for youth in residential facilities 30
Improving communication 32

APPENDICES

A - Residential Facilities ..... A-1 - A-7
B - Map of Residential Facilities B-1
C - Education Program Criteria for Private Residential Treatment Facilities ..... C-1 - C-3

Chapter I
Introduction

This Legislative Office of Education Oversight report describes the funding available for education services to students in residential facilities and examines the factors that affect state and local funding for these services.

Background

In Ohio, approximately 7,000 youth are served in an estimated 167 residential facilities on any given day. A "residential facility" is defined as one that has ten or more youth and provides 24-hour supervision and services, seven days a week.

Youth are placed in these facilities because they have committed a crime or suffer from abuse, neglect, addiction, or mental illness. The primary purpose of these facilities is to provide counseling and other forms of treatment that address the special needs of these youth and their families. A residential facility, however, must also meet the *educational* needs of youth in its care.

Unlike other residential living situations, such as group homes, students in most of these facilities are unable to attend nearby public schools because they are often considered a danger to themselves or others. These facilities, therefore, must work with an "education provider" to offer an education program in a "school" on the premises.

This Legislative Office of Education Oversight (LOEO) report describes how these education programs are funded. LOEO found that there is no "system" of education funding across these residential facilities. The education funding facilities receive is inconsistent and subject to ad hoc variations. The amount depends on such arbitrary factors as whether a local school district or educational service center is willing to work with the facility; whether a facility gets itself named in pilot project legislation; and how well a school district treasurer understands the nuances of school funding.

In addition, this report describes the resulting complexity and confusion surrounding education funding for youth in residential facilities. It explains the different types of facilities, their education providers, and the factors that affect the amount and flow of state and local education funds to the various providers. The report concludes with recommendations for how to improve the current situation.

Types of residential facilities

Public residential facilities. LOEO estimates that 167 residential facilities currently operate in Ohio. As Exhibit 1 indicates, 88 (53%) are public facilities that are operated by state or county government agencies.

There are four kinds of public residential facilities in Ohio:

- The Ohio Department of Youth Services (DYS) operates and funds 11 *state* facilities. The "DYS school district" provides education services to youth in these facilities.

- *County* DYS organizations (i.e., juvenile detention centers, juvenile rehabilitation centers, and community corrections facilities) operate 61 facilities. These facilities receive some funding from the Ohio Department of Youth Services, however, they are primarily supported by local tax dollars and function independently. DYS requires that all county DYS facilities undergo an approval process. In addition, some facilities choose to be licensed by agencies such as the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services.

- County Departments of Job and Family Services and Children Services Boards operate 16 residential facilities in Ohio. Roughly half of their funding comes from local tax dollars, with the remaining support coming from state and federal government. These facilities are licensed by the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services.

Private residential facilities. The remaining 79 (47%) of Ohio's 167 residential facilities are considered "private." These facilities are typically owned and operated by non-profit organizations; however, private, for-profit companies manage a few residential facilities as well. All private residential facilities are licensed by one or more of the following state agencies, depending on the services they provide:

- The Ohio Department of Job and Family Services (ODJFS);
- The Ohio Department of Mental Health (ODMH); and
- The Ohio Department of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Services (ODADAS).

The Ohio Department of Youth Services also contracts with some *private* residential facilities in order to keep youth close to their communities and families.

Youth served by residential facilities

LOEO found it difficult to determine exactly how many facilities exist and to calculate the exact number of youth placed in residential facilities because:

- Ohio does not maintain a unified database of residential facilities and the youth admitted to them; and

- Licensing agencies tend to include "bed counts" in their databases, rather than an actual count of youth on a particular day or an average daily occupancy. "Bed counts" represent the maximum number of youth a facility is licensed or approved to serve.

As mentioned, LOEO estimates that 7,000 youth are served by residential facilities in Ohio on any given day. This figure may overestimate the number of youth served *each day* because it is based on bed counts and residential facilities may not maintain maximum capacity every day. However, the *total* number of youth served by residential facilities throughout the year is higher than 7,000 because many youth are placed in facilities for short periods of time (e.g., three months).

Exhibit 1
Public and Private Residential Facilities Serving Ohio Youth
N = 167

Type of Facility	Number of Facilities[a]
Public facilities	
Ohio Department of Youth Services	11
County Department of Youth Services	61
County Departments of Job and Family Services & Children Services Boards	16
Total Public Facilities	**88**
Private facilities by licensing agency	
Ohio Department of Job and Family Services	61
Ohio Department of Mental Health	12
Ohio Department of Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services	6
Total Private Facilities	**79**
Overall Total	**167**

[a] Estimates based on a compilation of lists from the Ohio Departments of Education, Youth Services, Job and Family Services, Mental Health, and Alcohol and Drug Abuse Services.

Several organizations or individuals may place youth in residential facilities, including:

- The Ohio Department of Youth Services (DYS);
- Juvenile courts;
- County Family and Children First Councils;
- County Children Services Boards; and
- Their parents or guardians.

Youth are placed in residential facilities for a variety of reasons. All youth detained in state or county DYS facilities are pre-adjudicated or adjudicated delinquent. Pre-adjudicated delinquent youth are alleged to have committed a crime, but are awaiting trial. Adjudicated delinquent children have been found guilty of perpetrating a crime that would be considered a felony had it been committed by an adult.

Private residential facilities serve youth who are adjudicated delinquent, have emotional problems, or who are abused, neglected, or chemically dependent. Residential facilities often admit youth for a combination of reasons. For example, many adjudicated delinquent youth also require treatment for alcohol or drug addiction.

A list of residential facilities that LOEO could identify appears in Appendix A. Using a map of Ohio, Appendix B shows where these residential facilities are located.

Private Treatment Facility Pilot Project

In October 1993, a task force was initiated by representatives of the Ohio Department of Youth Services (DYS) and the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) to develop standards and consistent funding for the education programs in private residential

facilities serving adjudicated and pre-adjudicated youth. This initiative resulted from lobbying efforts from a private facility that wanted to contract with DYS to offer services to adjudicated and chemically dependent youth. The facility expected its education funding to come from a separate state fund and its on-grounds education program to be provided by the local school district, as it claims is the practice in Pennsylvania.

The *Task Force on Juvenile Correctional Education Funding and Standards* included representatives from the Ohio Association of Child Caring Agencies (OACCA), Ohio Family and Children First Councils, as well as representatives of DYS and ODE. According to its members, the task force outlined some minimum standards that education programs would have to meet in order to receive state funding. These standards included required teacher/student contact hours, proficiency testing, and Individual Education Programs (IEPs) for students with special needs.

The proposed funding consisted of the base cost that the state guarantees to school districts plus varying amounts of "incentive" dollars to cover the additional costs of intensive educational programming, including small class sizes and year-round schooling. Task force members told LOEO they estimated that such funding would total between $20-30 million. Despite repeated requests, no one from ODE, DYS, or OACCA could produce a copy of this funding proposal for LOEO's review.

When the task force brought its funding proposal of $20-30 million to members of the General Assembly, it was rejected as too costly. Instead, a "pilot project" was developed. The Private Treatment Facility Pilot Project was appropriated $1 million each fiscal year in the 1997 budget bill (Amended Substitute House Bill 215). This $1 million is used to pay the base cost for both regular education and special education students at participating facilities. In addition, the bill authorized education providers for these facilities to charge the districts of residence tuition for all students and excess costs for special education students.

A total of five residential facilities have participated in the pilot since its inception. Four of these were named in the original budget bill and one in a subsequent budget bill. Although the task force initially focused on private facilities that serve DYS youth, its hope was that the education standards and the funding mechanism developed for the pilot facilities would eventually be expanded to include all residential facilities in Ohio, not just an isolated few serving a small fraction of DYS youth.

Education standards

Education providers to residential facilities vary widely in terms of education standards for their on-grounds schools. At one end of the continuum, ODE monitors the five pilot project facilities annually using 34 specific standards. In addition, the 11 facilities in the DYS school district undergo annual evaluations that involve general education standards as part of their American Correctional Association (ACA) accreditation. Some of the county DYS facilities choose to be ACA accredited, however, it is not a requirement.

The licensure requirements of the 79 private facilities, as well as those operated by the county Departments of Job and Family Services and Children Services Boards, do not include education standards.

LOEO Study

Impetus for study

During the 1999 budget process, the Ohio Association of Child Caring Agencies (OACCA) raised its continuing concerns about education funding for youth in residential facilities. Problems described by OACCA included:

- A level of funding that residential facility administrators believe is inadequate to meet the educational needs of the at-risk students they serve;
- State funding mechanisms that are viewed as ill-suited to a highly mobile student population; and
- Ohio law requires a student's school district of residence to pay some of the cost of education in residential facilities; however, confusion over the identity of the district results in delays in funding and in the transfer of student records.

In response to these concerns, the Legislative Committee on Education Oversight asked LOEO to conduct a study of the education funding for residential facilities in Ohio.

Lack of data

LOEO was not able to determine the *amount* of funding needed for educating youth in residential facilities. No single source exists that could provide the data necessary to determine a statewide estimate of these costs. In fact, even when pieced together, the data that *are* maintained by the various licensing agencies, the Ohio Department of Youth Services, and the Ohio Department of Education could not provide the following information:

- The exact number of residential facilities;
- The number of facilities that provide education programs on their premises;
- The education provider for the facility;
- The number of youth served by residential facilities;
- The number of youth *with disabilities* served by facilities;
- The average length of stay for youth at the facilities;
- The number of youth placed in these facilities by juvenile courts, county Family and Children First Councils, Children Services Boards, and parents or guardians;
- The *extent* of education programming provided by residential facilities; and
- The *costs* associated with providing education programs to youth in facilities.

Study questions

Although LOEO was not able to estimate the statewide cost of funding education programs in residential facilities due to a lack of data, this report describes the variations in how education programs are funded. The following study questions are addressed:

1. Who provides education services to youth in residential facilities?
2. What public education funding do these providers receive?
3. What factors influence the *amount* and *flow* of public education funding to these education providers?

Fiscal year 2001 is the setting for the answers to these questions. Changes made to education funding in Amended Substitute House Bill 94 for fiscal years 2002 and 2003 are not reflected in this report.

Study methods

To gather data for this study, LOEO spoke with 30 administrators representing: residential facilities; education providers to facilities; state agencies that license residential facilities; state and county Department of Youth Services facilities; and various offices within the Ohio Department of Education. Data collection also included visits to four residential facilities and calls to all of the facilities to identify their education providers.

Report organization

The next chapter describes the education providers that serve residential facilities in Ohio and the amount of state and local funding they receive. Chapter III explains the factors that affect the *amount* of education funding as well as factors that influence the *flow* of funds to these providers. Chapter IV provides LOEO's conclusions and recommendations regarding education funding for youth in residential facilities.

Chapter II
Education Providers and Sources of Education Funding

This chapter describes the various providers of education services to youth in Ohio's residential facilities. It also identifies the sources of funding available to these providers and explains the different amounts of state and local funding they receive.

Youth in residential facilities are entitled to a public education the same as other students in Ohio. LOEO found that nine facilities provide limited or no formal instruction for youth in their care. Students in these facilities receive some assistance toward passing the General Educational Development (GED) test or completion of assignments sent by the school district of residence.

In the remaining facilities, LOEO found that youth receive education services from one of six *types* of providers:

- School districts;
- Residential facilities themselves;
- Educational Service Centers (ESCs);
- Chartered, non-public schools;
- The Department of Youth Services (DYS) school district; or
- Community schools.

LOEO also found that the amount of state and local education funding available to educate residential facility students *depends on the type of education provider*. Before discussing how education funding varies, however, it is important to define a few key terms related to school funding in Ohio.

****

School Funding Definitions

Average daily membership (ADM):
The *average daily membership* is the number of K–12 students enrolled in a school district that either attended school or had an excused absence during the first full week of October. Either the current or a three-year average ADM, whichever is greater, is used in the funding formula.

Base cost:
The *base cost* is the per pupil dollar figure established by the General Assembly to provide for the basic program costs for all students. This figure does not include the additional costs associated with student poverty, special needs, or transportation. The base cost for the 2000-2001 school year was $4,294.

Base cost formula funding:
Base cost formula funding refers to Ohio's method of funding schools in which both the state and local government contribute tax dollars to ensure that each district receives the base cost for all students.

Total base cost:
The *total base cost* is the product of multiplying the base cost by the ADM and the cost of doing business factor.

Cost of doing business factor:
The *cost of doing business factor* is a multiplier that adjusts the total base cost that a district receives to account for regional differences in labor costs. This adjustment provides additional funding to districts in counties that have higher labor costs.

Local share:
The *local share* is the portion of the total base cost that is funded by local taxes. In its simplest form, it is calculated by multiplying the district's property value by 23 mills.

State share:
The *state share* is the difference between a district's total base cost (the base cost multiplied by the ADM and the cost of doing business factor) and the local share. It is the funding provided by the state that, when added to the local share, ensures school districts receive the base cost for all students.

For example,* if a school district has an ADM of 1,281 students, a cost of doing business factor of 1.0653, and a property valuation of $112,952,705, the state share is calculated as follows.

First, the total base cost is calculated by multiplying the base cost by the district's ADM and the cost of doing business factor:

Base cost	$4,294
ADM	x 1,281
Cost of doing business factor	x 1.0653
Total base cost	**= $5,859,804**

Next, the local share is calculated by multiplying the district's property value by the "charge-off," which is 23 mills:

Property valuation	$112,952,705
Charge-off (23 mills)	x 0.023
Local share	**= $2,597,912**

The state share equals the total base cost minus the local share:

Total base cost	$5,859,804
Local share	- $2,597,912
State share	**= $3,261,892**

Furthermore, the state share percent can be calculated by dividing the state share by the total base cost:

State share	$3,261,892
Total base cost	÷ $5,859,804
State share percent	**= 0.56 or 56%**

* All examples in this report are based on the school district that had the median state share in fiscal year 2001 of 56%.

State base cost funding to school districts, therefore, is calculated on an aggregate, rather than a per pupil, basis. However, for the purpose of this report, to illustrate the varying levels of state education funding available to different providers, LOEO had to calculate an average of the state base cost funding per pupil. The "average state base cost per pupil" is a constructed average amount that is useful for comparison purposes, but does not reflect how state base cost funding is actually calculated for any school district. The per pupil amount is the **product** of the state funding formula, not part of it.

****

For example, if a district has a state share of $3,261,892 and an ADM of 1,281, the district averages $2,546 per pupil in state funding:

State share	$3,261,892
ADM	÷ 1,281
Average state base cost per pupil	**= $2,546**

It is this *average* amount that LOEO will use for the purpose of comparing state funding available to education providers serving residential facilities.

Special education weighted amount:
In Ohio, public school districts receive a *special education weighted amount* in addition to the base cost for students with disabilities. This additional weighted amount varies according to the severity of the student's disability. In fiscal year 2001, students identified as specific learning disabled, other health handicapped, or developmentally handicapped received a weight of 0.22. Students identified as hearing handicapped, orthopedically handicapped, vision impaired, multi-handicapped, severe behavior handicapped, traumatic brain injury, autism, and deaf-blind received a weight of 3.01.

The state share of the special education weighted amount is calculated by multiplying the base cost by the appropriate special education weight and the state share percent.

For example, if a school district's state share percent is 56%, the state share of the special education weighted amount for a severe behavior handicapped student is:

Base cost	$4,294
Special education weight	x 3.01
State share percent	x 0.56
Special education weighted amount	**= $7,238**

If the state base cost payment for this school district averages $2,546 per pupil, LOEO assumes, for comparison purposes, that the total amount of state funding this school district receives for this special education student is:

$7,238 + $2,546 = $9,784.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Unit funding:
Prior to the 1998 Amended Substitute House Bill 650 of the 122nd General Assembly, which established weighted funding, Ohio funded special education using a method known as *unit funding*. This method continues to be used to fund special education in the DYS school district. A "unit" is a group of students with the same disability. The number of students allowed in a unit depends on their disability. The funding for each unit includes an amount equal to the unit teacher's salary according to the state minimum salary schedule, additional funds equal to 15% of that salary amount for fringe benefits, and a supplemental unit allowance.

Tuition:
Tuition is the per pupil amount that a school district is allowed to bill a district of residence for educating a non-resident student. Tuition is *local* funding for education since it is based on property and income taxes collected by the school district. In fiscal year 2001, tuition amounts ranged from $604 to $16,792 per pupil across Ohio's 612 school districts. The median tuition rate was $3,144. School districts that collect more local taxes (i.e., wealthier districts) have higher tuition amounts.

****

Ohio law prescribes the following formula to calculate tuition:

$$\frac{\text{School district's total property taxes charged and payable for a given year} + \text{District's total taxes collected under a school district income tax}}{\text{District's ADM}}$$

Excess costs:
Some education providers are also permitted to bill a student's school district of residence for the *excess costs* associated with providing special education services. Education providers calculate these excess costs by subtracting the state and local funding received for educating a student from the actual costs of educating that youth.

For example, assume the actual costs of educating a severe behavior handicapped student funded with a weight of 3.01 equal $15,000. The education provider receives the average state base cost, the state share of the special education weighted amount, and tuition from the school district of residence for that student. The education provider calculates the excess costs by subtracting these amounts from the actual costs of educating the special education student:

Actual costs	$15,000
Average state base cost per pupil	- $2,546
State share of special education weighted amount	- $7,238
Tuition (local)	- $3,144
Excess costs	**= $2,072**

Therefore, this education provider bills the school district of residence for excess costs in the amount of $2,072.

Auxiliary funding:
Auxiliary funding refers to the money appropriated for education programs in chartered, non-public schools for the purpose of purchasing textbooks, services (e.g., speech and hearing diagnostic services), and educational equipment. The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) gives this money to the local public school district, which purchases textbooks, services, and equipment on behalf of the chartered, non-public school. Districts received $490 per pupil in auxiliary funds for chartered, non-public school students in the 2000-2001 school year.

****

Education Providers

The six types of education providers, the number of residential facilities they serve, and their sources of state and local education funding are displayed in Exhibit 2.

School districts are the most common education provider, serving 94 (56%) of the 167 facilities. Community schools are the least common education provider, serving only two (1%) facilities. Three different types of providers offer education services in the five pilot project facilities: school districts; ESCs; and chartered, non-public schools.

As mentioned, LOEO discovered that the amount of education funding for youth in residential facilities depends on the type of education provider. The amount of funding varies because different education providers have access to different sources of state and local education funding.

For example, providers to pilot project facilities receive the full base cost and tuition for both regular and special education students plus excess costs for special education students. In contrast, residential facilities that provide their own education services receive no state or local education funding. Descriptions of the education providers and the funding they receive follow Exhibit 2.

Exhibit 2
Sources of State and Local Education Funding by Type of Education Provider

Education Provider	Residential Facilities Served N = 167[abc]	Sources of State and Local Education Funding	
		Regular education students	***Special education students***
School district	N = 92	• *State share* of base cost • Tuition (local)	• *State share* of base cost • *State share* of special education weighted amount • Tuition (local) • Excess costs (local)
Residential facility itself	N = 19	None	None
Educational Service Center (ESC)	N = 14	Negotiated	Negotiated
Chartered, non-public school	N = 13	Auxiliary funding (state)	Auxiliary funding (state)
DYS school district	N = 11	• DYS budget appropriation (state) • Tuition (local)	Unit funding[d] (state)
Various providers	Private Treatment Facility Pilot Project N = 5	• *Full* base cost (state) • Tuition (local)	• *Full* base cost (state) • Tuition (local) • Excess costs (local)
Community school	N = 2	*Full* base cost times the cost of doing business factor (state)	• *Full* base cost times the cost of doing business factor (state) • *Full* special education weighted amount (state)

[a] Numbers are unduplicated. In three cases, facilities are served by more than one provider.
[b] Nine facilities report providing limited or no formal instruction.
[c] Two facilities did not respond to LOEO's request for information regarding their education provider.
[d] The DYS school district also receives unit funding for vocational education.

School districts

School districts serve as education providers in 94 residential facilities; two of these are pilot project facilities, which are discussed later. Of the remaining 92 facilities, 52 contract with the district in which they are located to provide education services on the facility premises. The principal and teachers of the on-grounds school are employees of the school district. Youth in the other 40 facilities attend nearby public schools.

School districts that serve as education providers to residential facilities are permitted to include facility students in their ADM and receive the average state base cost for those students. In addition, these providers are also allowed to bill districts of residence for tuition.

Similarly, for special education students, school districts that serve as providers receive the average state base cost and the state share of the special education weighted amount. In addition, these providers bill the school district of residence for tuition and excess costs (Ohio Revised Code Sections 3317.08 and 3323.14).

Exhibit 3 provides an example of the amount of state and local education funding a school district receives for providing an education program to a residential facility.

****

Exhibit 3
Example of Per Pupil Education Funding for a School District

	Regular Education	Special Education
Average state base cost per pupil[ab]	$2,546	$2,546
Tuition[c]	$3,144	$3,144
Special education weighted amount	---	$7,238[bd]
Excess costs	---	$2,072[e]
Total	**$5,690**	**$15,000**

[a] The "average state base cost" is a constructed average amount that is useful for comparison purposes only.
[b] Example based on the median state share of 56% – fiscal year 2001.
[c] Example based on the median tuition rate in Ohio – fiscal year 2001.
[d] Example based on special education weight of 3.01 (severe behavior handicapped student) – fiscal year 2001.
[e] Example assumes actual costs equal $15,000.

Since school districts that serve as education providers are permitted to bill districts of residence, they are able to recover some of the expenses incurred from educating youth in facilities. These districts, however, must dedicate staff resources to the administration of the billing process, which includes identifying the school district of residence for each student. In most instances, this process is time-consuming and requires extensive knowledge of the various funding mechanisms.

Facilities as education providers

LOEO determined that 19 residential facilities provide their own education services. They employ teachers and some also hire aides to provide instruction on the premises. These facilities do not receive education funding from the state, nor do they have the authority under Ohio law to bill districts of residence for education costs. If a facility bills a district of residence and it refuses to pay, ODE cannot help the facility collect the funding from that district. These

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

facilities, therefore, embed education costs in their bills for "treatment" to the agency that placed the student.

Educational Service Centers

Educational Service Centers (ESCs) provide instruction to students in 16 residential facilities in Ohio. Two of those facilities participate in the pilot project, which is discussed later. Of the remaining 14, nine serve public facilities and five serve private facilities.

ESCs negotiate an amount for the education services they provide with the district of residence. LOEO spoke with administrators at three ESCs that serve as providers to facilities. These administrators reported that they bill for the actual costs of educating the youth in the facilities for both regular and special education students.

ESCs differ, however, in who they bill. Two ESCs bill the districts of residence for the actual costs. One ESC bills the "attending" district for the average state base cost and bills the districts of residence for excess costs. The attending district is the school district in which the facility is located. This district is permitted to include facility students in its ADM. If the attending district fails to include facility students in its ADM, it must in turn bill the students' districts of residence.

Similar to school districts providing education services to facilities, ESCs dedicate staff resources to the administration of the billing process, which includes handling disputes about the district of residence.

ESCs also differ regarding when they bill school districts. Some bill monthly while others wait until the end of the school year. The latter may be burdensome to some districts, particularly small ones, because they may not expect to receive such a bill at the end of their fiscal year. For example, if a district has a severe behavior handicapped student who lived in a facility for an entire year, it might receive a bill for $15,000.

Chartered, non-public schools

LOEO identified 13 residential facilities with chartered, non-public schools on-grounds. One of those facilities participates in the pilot project, which is discussed later. Chartered, non-public schools benefit from state auxiliary funding ($490 per student for the 2000-2001 school year). They are not eligible to receive regular or special education funding from the state, nor can they bill for local tuition and excess costs.

The DYS school district

Chartered in 1992 by the State Board of Education, the DYS school district provides education services to youth in 11 facilities statewide. Although DYS teachers are certified similar to other teachers, they are employees of DYS rather than a school district. In addition, school principals report to the superintendent of the residential facility rather than to the DYS school district superintendent.

The DYS school district does <u>not</u> receive the average state base cost for the students it serves. It does, however, receive funding through the general revenue fund of the Ohio Department of Youth Services. In fiscal year 2000, the DYS school district received $3,779,448 from the DYS General Revenue Fund (line item 470–401). As Exhibit 4 indicates, this appropriation is equivalent to $1,369 per pupil. This figure

is based on the most recent count of students (2,761 in fiscal year 2000).

The DYS school district also receives local tuition for both regular and special education students. In fiscal year 2000, the DYS school district received $6,460,171 in tuition ($4,181,625 for regular education students and $2,278,546 for special education students).

****

Exhibit 4
Example of Per Pupil Education Funding for DYS School District[a]

	Regular Education	Special Education
DYS appropriation[b]	$1,369	$1,369
Unit funding (special education)	---	$1,471[c]
Tuition (from district of residence)[d]	$3,144	$3,144
Total	**$4,513**	**$5,984**

[a] DYS also received $1.7 million in unit funding for vocational education in fiscal year 2000.
[b] Example based on $3,779,448 from the DYS General Revenue Fund for fiscal year 2000.
[c] Example based on $1,340,160 that DYS received for special education unit funding from ODE in fiscal year 2000.
[d] Example based on the median tuition rate in Ohio – fiscal year 2001.

The DYS school district receives assistance from ODE in obtaining tuition from districts of residence. It provides ODE with the name, address, and number of instructional days for its students. ODE, in turn, deducts the amount of local tuition from the state funding the district of residence would otherwise receive and credits that amount to the DYS school district. If ODE did not provide this assistance, the DYS district would be responsible for billing the school districts of residence, costing staff time.

The school district of residence may, in turn, seek reimbursement for the tuition that was deducted by ODE if it did not include the student in its ADM. ODE reimburses these school districts through a $2 million set-aside in its budget. If claims exceed $2 million, then the amount reimbursed to each district is reduced proportionately.

Unit funding. The DYS school district continues to receive unit funding for special education. According to DYS administrators, they retained unit funding because students in their facilities are highly mobile. Because it receives unit funding for special education, DYS does not bill school districts of residence for excess costs.

In fiscal year 2000, the DYS school district received $1,340,160 to pay for 15.73 classroom units and two related-services units. Related services include teacher assistants, behavioral intervention, and speech and hearing services that special education students may require, in addition to their classroom instruction. DYS estimates that 911 students in the DYS school district required special education services in fiscal year 2000. The $1,340,160 in unit funding for special education and related services is equivalent to $1,471 per pupil.

As mentioned, the Task Force on Juvenile Correctional Education Funding and Standards proposed that the General Assembly provide $20-30 million in education funding for youth in residential facilities. The General Assembly rejected this proposal as too costly and chose to develop the Private Treatment Facility Pilot Project instead.

In 1997, Amended Substitute House Bill 215 established the Private Treatment Facility Pilot Project and funded it with a $1 million set-aside each fiscal year. This $1 million is used to pay the *full* base cost for both regular and special education students at participating facilities, not just the state portion of the base cost. In addition, the bill authorized providers for these facilities to charge the districts of residence tuition for all students and excess costs for special education students. Finally, education providers to the pilot project facilities receive assistance from ODE in obtaining tuition from students' districts of residence.

Because they receive *both* the full base cost from the state and tuition from local districts, providers for pilot project facilities receive much more funding for regular education students than other providers.

For special education students, the funding includes the full base cost, tuition, and excess costs. However, the state *does not* pay the state share of the special education weighted amount. As a result, the district of residence must pay more excess costs. Exhibit 5 summarizes the education funding available to participants in the pilot project.

****

Exhibit 5
Example of Per Pupil Education Funding for Private Treatment Facility Pilot Project

	Regular Education	Special Education
Base cost[a]	$4,294	$4,294
Tuition[b]	$3,144	$3,144
Excess costs	---	$7,562[c]
Total	**$7,438**	**$15,000**

[a] Pilot project participants receive the full base cost.
[b] Example based on the median tuition rate in Ohio - fiscal year 2001.
[c] Example assumes actual costs equal $15,000.

Eligibility for the pilot project. According to Am. Sub. H.B. 215, residential facilities can participate in the Private Treatment Facility Pilot Project in two ways. First, participating facilities must have a contract with DYS *and* receive DYS support through appropriation item 470-401 RECLAIM Ohio. This program serves adjudicated delinquent youth in their own communities, thereby reserving incarceration in state DYS facilities for more serious offenders. *Or*, second, the facility must be named in law.

Am. Sub. H.B. 215 named four facilities as participants in the pilot project

(a fifth was added in 1999 by Amended Substitute House Bill 282). Education providers to these five facilities include two school districts, an ESC (which serves two facilities), and a chartered, non-public school. This chartered, non-public school continues to benefit from auxiliary funding in addition to the education funding provided to pilot project participants described earlier. Thus, it receives slightly more education funding than other pilot project providers.

Community schools

During the 2000-2001 school year, two community schools in Ohio were located on the premises of residential facilities, JADES Academy and Lighthouse Community School. JADES Academy was located in St. Anthony's Villa residential facility and was sponsored by the Lucas County Educational Service Center. (JADES Academy closed before the start of the 2001-2002 school year.) Lighthouse Community School, located in Lighthouse Youth Services facilities, is sponsored by the Cincinnati City School District.

Similar to all community schools, JADES Academy and Lighthouse Community School receive the *full* base cost times the cost of doing business factor for regular education students. In addition, they receive the *full* special education weighted amount for special education students from the state. They do not receive any local funding in the form of tuition or excess costs.

Exhibit 6 shows an example of the amount of education funding that community schools in residential facilities receive for a regular education student and a special education student with a weight of 3.01.

Exhibit 6
Example of Per Pupil Education Funding for Community Schools

	Regular Education	Special Education
Base cost[a]	$4,574	$4,574
Special education weighted amount	---	$12,925[b]
Total	**$4,574**	**$17,499**

[a] Example based on full base cost times the cost of doing business factor of 1.0653 associated with the district that has the median state share.

[b] Example based on special education weight of 3.01 (severe behavior handicapped student) – fiscal year 2001 multiplied by the full base cost of $4,294.

Comparing the Amount of Funding across Education Providers

Exhibit 7 illustrates how the amount of education funding for the *same* regular education student depends on which education provider serves the residential facility.

For comparison purposes, LOEO calculated an average of the state base cost per pupil; however, this amount does not reflect how state base cost funding is actually calculated for any school district.

The per pupil amount for *public* providers ranges from $4,513 for the DYS school district to $7,438 for the pilot project. The pilot project providers receive more than others because they get the *full* base cost from the state and local tuition.

None of the other providers receive both the *full* base cost and tuition. School districts receive a portion of the base cost from the state, which LOEO calculated as the "average state base cost." They also receive local tuition.

The DYS school district does not receive state funding through ODE, however, it receives some state funding through a DYS appropriation. This amount is less than half of the base cost.

Community schools receive the *full* base cost times the cost of doing

Exhibit 7
Example of Education Funding for the *Same* Regular Education Student Served by *Various* Education Providers
Fiscal Year 2001

	Public					Non-public	
	School district	**ESC**	**DYS school district**	**Private Treatment Facility Pilot Project**	**Community school**	**Residential facility**	**Chartered, non-public school**
Base cost	$2,546[ab] (average state base cost)		---	$4,294 (*full* base cost)	$4,574[c]	---	---
Tuition[d]	$3,144		$3,144	$3,144	---	---	---
DYS appropriation (per pupil)	---		$1,369[e]	---	---	---	---
Auxiliary funding	---		---	---	---	---	$490
Total	**$5,690**	**Negotiated**	**$4,513**	**$7,438**	**$4,574**	**$0**	**$490**

[a] The "average state base cost" is a constructed average amount that is useful for comparison purposes only.
[b] Example based on the median state share of 56% – fiscal year 2001.
[c] Example based on full base cost times the cost of doing business factor of 1.0653 associated with the district that has the median state share.
[d] Example based on the median tuition rate in Ohio – fiscal year 2001.
[e] Example based on $3,779,448 from the DYS General Revenue Fund for fiscal year 2000.

business factor, but they do not receive local funding. It is difficult to compare ESCs with other providers because they negotiate the amount they charge for educating a student; therefore, the amount they receive may vary.

Non-public providers receive little or no education funding. As mentioned, residential facilities that provide education services themselves receive no education funding. Chartered, non-public schools benefit from state auxiliary funding, which equaled $490 per pupil in the 2000-2001 school year.

Similarly, Exhibit 8 illustrates how the amount of funding for the *same* special education student depends on the education provider.

Exhibit 8
Example of Education Funding for the *Same* Special Education Student Served by *Various* Education Providers[a]
Fiscal Year 2001

	Public					Non-Public	
	School district	**ESC**	**DYS school district**	**Private Treatment Facility Pilot Project**	**Community school**	**Residential facility**	**Chartered, non-public school**
Base cost	$2,546[ab] (average state base cost)		---	$4,294 (*full* base cost)	$4,574[c]	---	---
Tuition[d]	$3,144		$3,144	$3,144	---	---	---
Special education weighted amount	$7,238[be]		---	---	$12,925[f]	---	---
Excess costs[g]	$2,072		---	$7,562	---	---	---
DYS appropriation (per pupil)	---		$1,369[h]	---	---	---	---
Unit funding (per pupil)	---		$1,471[i]	---	---	---	---
Auxiliary funding	---		---	---	---	---	$490
Total	**$15,000**	**Negotiated**	**$5,984**	**$15,000**	**$17,499**	**$0**	**$490**

[a] The "average state base cost" is a constructed average amount that is useful for comparison purposes only.
[b] Example based on the median state share of 56% – fiscal year 2001.
[c] Example based on the full base cost times the cost of doing business factor of 1.0653 associated with the district that has the median state share.
[d] Example based on the median tuition rate in Ohio – fiscal year 2001.
[e] Example based on a special education weight of 3.01 (severe behavior handicapped student) – fiscal year 2001.
[f] Example based on special education weight of 3.01 (severe behavior handicapped student) – fiscal year 2001 multiplied by the full base cost of $4,294.
[g] Example assumes actual costs equal $15,000.
[h] Example based on $3,779,448 from the DYS General Revenue Fund for fiscal year 2000.
[i] Example based on $1,340,160 that DYS received for unit funding from ODE in fiscal year 2000.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The calculated per pupil amount for public providers varies from a low of $5,984 for the DYS school district to a high of $17,499 for community schools. This example assumes that the actual costs of educating a severe behavior handicapped special education student equals $15,000 per year.

School districts and pilot project providers receive the actual amount because they are allowed to bill districts of residence for any excess costs. Pilot project funding, however, places a greater financial burden on districts of residence because pilot project providers do not receive the special education weighted amount from the state. Instead, they bill districts of residence for the costs that would be covered by the special education weighted amount.

Community schools receive more than other providers in this example because the state allows them to receive the *full* base cost times the cost of doing business factor plus the special education weighted amount. As a reminder, this special education weighted amount equals the *full* base cost times the 3.01 weight. For school districts, it equals the *state share* of the base cost times the 3.01 weight. Community schools, therefore, may receive more than the actual costs for a special education student.

Among the non-public providers, residential facilities that provide their own education services receive no special education funding from state or local sources. Chartered, non-public schools benefit from $490 per pupil, which is the same amount as regular education students.

****

Other Sources of Funding

In addition to state and local funding, many providers receive federal funding through Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (for neglected and delinquent children).

Private residential facilities are also eligible to receive limited state funding through the juvenile court system. ODE is allowed by law to disburse a maximum of $2,500 per year for each student (up to $425,000 total) to juvenile courts to defray the costs of educating youth placed by the court in private residential facilities. This $425,000 is from line item 200-501, Base Cost Funding.

Two juvenile courts used this funding source during fiscal year 2001. Cuyahoga County Juvenile Court received a total of $222,170, all of which was disbursed to private residential facilities out-of-state. Hamilton County Juvenile Court began receiving this type of funding in the last half of fiscal year 2001. It received a total of $183,496, all of which was disbursed to one facility in Ohio.

The fact that just two courts received a total of $405,666 in fiscal year 2001 suggests that the $425,000 may be insufficient, given that all juvenile courts are permitted to use this source of funding. In addition, this finding suggests that many juvenile court judges are unaware of its existence or are unclear about when it can be used.

Some chartered, non-public schools also seek and receive funding or donations from sources such as businesses, churches, and individuals. For example, a chartered, non-public school in a religiously-affiliated residential facility may receive financial support from a church.

Monitoring of Education Standards

As mentioned, providers vary widely in terms of education standards and the monitoring of their education programs. At one end of the continuum are the pilot project providers. Am. Sub. H.B. 215 required ODE to monitor the education programs in pilot project facilities annually using 34 criteria in the following areas:

- Administration and management;
- General requirements (e.g., teacher/pupil ratio and number of days in school calendar);
- Educator qualifications and requirements;
- Special education;
- Proficiency tests and evaluation of outcomes;
- Assessment;
- Records and transition (e.g., credits earned in pilot project school shall be accepted by any Ohio school that student subsequently attends);
- Content of education (e.g., instruction must be responsive to youth with deficits in reading and/or math); and
- Behavior management.

ODE's monitoring of the pilot project, however, does not evaluate the funding process established by the program to determine its usefulness to residential facilities statewide.

As part of their accreditation by the American Correctional Association (ACA), the 11 DYS facilities are also held accountable using education standards. These standards, however, are more general than those established for the pilot project. This accreditation requires that facilities evaluate their education programs annually and includes standards such as:

- Provide educational assessment and counseling to meet the academic needs of students;
- Offer remedial services;
- Employ certified teachers; and
- Offer flexible scheduling so that students can enter the program at any time and learn at their own pace.

As noted, some of the county DYS facilities choose to be accredited by the ACA, therefore, they would also undergo an annual evaluation and adhere to these standards. The on-grounds education programs in over 100 facilities, both private and those operated by the county Departments of Job and Family Services and Children Services Boards, do not have to meet any education standards.

****

Summary

LOEO found that six types of providers offer education services to youth in residential facilities and that these education providers receive different amounts of public education funding from various state and local sources.

For comparison purposes, LOEO calculated an "average state base cost per pupil," even though this does not reflect how state base cost funding is actually calculated. In LOEO's example, the amount that providers receive for regular education students ranges from zero to $7,438 per

pupil. For special education students, the amount varies from zero to $17,499.

School districts receive the average state base cost and tuition for regular education students. For special education students, they receive the average state base cost, the state share of the special education weighted amount, tuition, and excess costs. Tuition and excess costs are paid by the students' districts of residence.

The amount of education funding that ESCs receive for educating youth in facilities varies. ESCs negotiate with facility staff to determine the amount charged for providing education services.

The DYS school district receives state funding through a DYS appropriation for all students. It also receives local tuition for all students and state unit funding for special education students.

Education providers to pilot project facilities receive more public education funding for regular education students than other providers because they receive the *full* base cost from the state and tuition (from school districts of residence) for all students. In addition, they are allowed to bill school districts of residence for excess costs for special education students.

Community schools also receive the *full* base cost from the state. In addition, for special education students, they can receive more than the actual costs of educating these students because the special education weighted amount is multiplied by this *full* base cost amount, rather than just the state share of the base cost.

Residential facilities that provide their own education services receive no public education funding. Chartered, non-public schools are limited to state auxiliary funding, $490 per pupil in fiscal year 2001.

Chapter III
Additional Factors Influencing Funding to Education Providers

This chapter describes additional factors that influence the amount of funds education providers receive as well as factors that help and hinder the flow of funds to these providers.

Factors Affecting the Actual Amount of Funding

In the previous chapter, LOEO described how the amount of education funding differs depending on the type of education provider and whether a facility participates in the pilot project. This chapter identifies two additional factors that influence the amount of funds actually available for educating a student in a residential facility: whether the student is counted in the provider's average daily membership (ADM); and how many days a student is enrolled.

Residential facility students not included in ADM

LOEO found that some residential facility students are not counted in the ADM of any district; therefore, less state funding is available for their education. Education *providers* are permitted to include these students in their ADM if the student was enrolled during the first full week in October when the "count" is taken. LOEO learned, however, that some providers do not include these students in their ADM because they are unaware that they are allowed to do so.

In addition, facility students may not be included in the ADM of their *school district of residence*. For example a student might live in the residential facility when the October count occurs. Unaware of the student's whereabouts, the district of residence does not include the student in the count. As a result, the student may not be included in either ADM. In this case, neither the education provider nor the school district of residence receives *state* education funding for that student.

There are different consequences for not including a special education student in the provider's ADM. The amount of funding coming to the provider is the same, but the source of the funding differs. Instead of the state contributing the base cost and the special education weighted amount, the district of residence is billed for all the actual costs as tuition and excess costs.

Student mobility

The previous funding illustrations are based on the assumption that the student is served for the entire school year. In fact, students are placed in residential facilities at different points during the school year and stay for varying lengths of time. However, for most providers, Ohio's method for determining the amount of *state* funding they receive does not take into account the number of days a student is actually in a facility.

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) makes monthly payments to education providers between July and January based on an estimated ADM the provider submits in July. Beginning in February, ODE adjusts the monthly payments based on the October ADM count.

If the residential facility student is included in the provider's October ADM count, that provider receives state funding for that student for the entire year, independent of how long the student stays in the facility. On the other hand, if a residential facility student arrives after the October ADM count, the education provider would not receive any state funding for that student for any portion of the year.

The funding mechanism for the DYS school district and the pilot project differs from that used for other providers because it takes into account the high rate of student mobility. These education providers submit forms to ODE twice a year that report the number of instructional days each student receives for each reporting period. The amount of funding these providers receive, therefore, is based on the actual number of days of instruction, rather than on whether the student appears in the October count.

Student mobility also affects *local* education funding. As mentioned, some providers bill school districts of residence for tuition. Unlike state funding, the amount of tuition for which the district of residence is billed is prorated for the number of days of instruction the student received.

Student mobility can also make it difficult for an education provider to identify the district of residence because the student may have attended multiple school districts. As a result, the provider cannot bill an unknown district for tuition or excess costs.

****

Factors that Hinder the Flow of Education Funding

Incomplete or missing school records

Residential facility administrators explained that they experience delays in obtaining school records, and therefore funding, because of difficulty identifying students' school district of residence. If students' school records are incomplete or missing when they enter the facility, it is difficult to identify the school district of residence for billing purposes.

Incomplete or missing school records also contribute to delays in identifying students for special education. If an education provider believes that a student needs special education, it must contact the district of residence to determine if an Individualized Education Program (IEP) exists. An IEP is developed through the cooperation of parents, teachers, and other school staff to guide the delivery of special education and related services to students with disabilities. If no IEP exists, the education provider can begin the identification process.

The identification process includes a multifactored evaluation (MFE). The MFE requires that a team of professionals from various fields assesses the student in areas related to the suspected disability, such as the child's vision, hearing, emotional status, cognitive functioning, academic performance, and vocational/occupational needs.

The education provider must pay the costs incurred in the identification process until it is reimbursed by the student's school district of residence. If the student is not identified as needing special education or the student's district of residence cannot be identified, the provider is forced to pay the costs of the MFE.

"After-the-fact" vs. "up-front" funding

One of the concerns surrounding education funding for youth in residential facilities is *when* the money arrives. Most of the education providers bill school districts of residence for tuition or excess costs for the number of days their students were actually served. Consequently, this funding arrives "after-the-fact," although teachers must be paid and instructional materials must be purchased beforehand. In some instances, it may be months before the payment is received. This policy places the vast majority of providers in a financial bind, at least temporarily. Furthermore, a provider is forced to absorb the cost of educating a student whose district of residence cannot be determined.

A few providers, however, have access to education funds "up-front," which allows them to have teachers and materials in place when a new youth arrives at the facility. The DYS school district, serving 11 state facilities, receives funding through the DYS general revenue fund ($3.78 million in fiscal year 2000) and unit funding for special education students. These dollars support an education program during the wait for tuition dollars from the districts of residence.

The providers to the five pilot project facilities receive funding "up-front" from the $1 million set-aside. This funding allows ODE to make regular payments for the full base cost funding using an initial estimate of the number of students to be served. This number is revised with the actual enrollment and the funds are adjusted accordingly. These education providers are not placed in the same financial bind as they wait for tuition and excess cost payments from districts of residence.

Confusion about ODE's disbursement of funds

Some school districts that serve as education providers complained that ODE's method of transferring funds to school districts in a lump sum makes it difficult to determine how much money should go to serving residential facility students. For example, a school district serving as a provider might receive $250,000 for "special education." Since the amount includes funding for both facility students and students attending regular schools in the district, the treasurer may find it difficult and time consuming to determine how much of that money is designated for the program in the facility.

If the amount the treasurer calculates should be received for the facility differs from the amount transferred by ODE, delays result as the treasurer attempts to reconcile the difference with ODE.

Complexities of billing

For many facility youth, the education provider differs from the district of residence. And, in some instances, the education provider differs from the attending district. As mentioned, the attending district is the public school district in which the facility is located. In these instances, the provider bills the attending district for the average state base cost and the state share of the special education

weighted amount. The attending district, in turn, bills the district of residence for those amounts. The education provider, however, bills excess costs for special education students to the district of residence directly.

Who pays?

Ohio law regarding who is responsible for tuition payment often adds to the confusion of education funding for youth in residential facilities. In most cases, the district of residence is responsible. The district of residence is the public school district in which the parent resides.

Section 3313.64 of the Ohio Revised Code, however, states that the district responsible for tuition payment differs for regular and special education students when the parent's residence is unknown.

For regular education students, the district in which the *student* lived when he was removed from the parent's home is responsible for tuition payment. For special education students, the last district in which the *parent* is known to have lived is responsible. Since facilities serve both regular and special education students, the provider must be aware of this difference when billing. Otherwise, the district billed may dispute the charge, resulting in delays in funding.

****

Factors that Help the Flow of Education Funding

Juvenile courts noting school district of residence

Ohio law requires juvenile court judges to indicate the school district responsible for paying the education costs when committing a child to the Department of Youth Services or other residential facility. Several facility administrators reported that judges are now more diligent in noting the district of residence than in the past. The number of children who enter a facility without a district of residence recorded has decreased. Facilities are able to secure school records more quickly and reduce delays in obtaining education funding.

Juvenile courts, however, represent only one of five ways in which youth are placed in residential facilities. Identifying the district of residence is still a concern for youth placed by other agencies such as DYS, county Family and Children First Councils, and county Children Services Boards.

Staff resources dedicated to securing funding

Some education providers and residential facilities are able to commit staff to securing tuition and excess costs from students' school districts of residence. They assign staff to identify the district of residence for students admitted to the facility. These staff members work with probation officers, caseworkers, and ODE's Office of School Finance to obtain this information.

The DYS school district and pilot project providers receive assistance from ODE in obtaining tuition and excess costs from school districts of residence for youth in those facilities. As a result, these

providers do not have to devote staff resources to billing districts of residence. Other providers do not receive this assistance from ODE.

Staff resources are also invested in determining what is included in calculating the excess costs that should be billed to districts of residence. For example, one school district that serves as a provider to a residential facility was able to increase the education funding it receives by correcting its method of calculating excess costs for special education. After correcting its mistake, the provider was able to bill districts of residence for a larger amount.

Chapter IV
Conclusions and Recommendations

This chapter provides LOEO's conclusions and recommendations regarding local and state education funding for youth in residential facilities.

Summary

LOEO estimates that 167 residential facilities serve about 7,000 youth on any given day in Ohio. These residential facilities provide supervision and services to ten or more youth 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Youth in residential facilities are often unable to attend nearby public schools because they have committed crimes or have behavioral problems resulting from abuse, neglect, addiction, or mental illness. As a result, education programs are provided on the premises of most residential facilities.

Of the 167 facilities, 53% are public, operated by the Ohio Department of Youth Services (DYS) and county DYS and social service agencies. The remaining facilities are considered "private," operated by non-profit organizations and for-profit companies.

LOEO identified six types of providers that offer education programs in residential facilities:

- School districts;
- Residential facilities themselves;
- Educational Service Centers (ESCs);
- Chartered, non-public schools;
- The Department of Youth Services (DYS) school district; and
- Community schools.

LOEO found that there is no "system" of education funding across the different types of education providers. The amount of funding depends on the type of education provider because they have access to different *sources* of state and local funding. As a result, different providers serving the *same* student would receive a different *amount* of funding for that student. In LOEO's example, the amount that providers receive for regular education students ranges from zero to $7,438 per pupil. For special education students, the amount varies from zero to $17,499.

LOEO learned that the amount of state and local funding education providers receive also depends on a variety of ad hoc factors including:

- Whether a facility participates in the pilot project;
- Whether facility students are included in the provider's ADM; and
- When students enter a facility and how long they stay.

Finally, LOEO identified factors that affect the *flow* of state and local education funding to education providers. Factors that *hinder* the flow of education funding include:

- Incomplete or missing school records that make identifying the district of residence difficult or impossible;
- A lack of "up-front" funds to pay for education services;
- Confusion and disagreement about the funding received for facility students;
- Complex billing procedures; and
- Differences in the district responsible for tuition payment for regular and special education students when the parent's residence is unknown.

Factors that *help* education providers obtain education funding include juvenile court judges identifying the district of residence and providers devoting staff resources to identifying the district of residence.

The Private Treatment Facility Pilot Project

Am. Sub. H.B. 215 of the 122nd General Assembly created the Private Treatment Facility Pilot Project in 1997 to provide education funding to private residential facilities that serve DYS youth. This legislation specifically named four facilities as participants (a fifth was added in 1999 by Am. Sub. H. B. 282), but permitted other facilities to participate if they:

- Had a contract with DYS; and
- Received DYS support through appropriation item 470-401 (RECLAIM Ohio).

It also mandated that ODE track the utilization of funds paid to education providers for participating facilities, monitor the effect of this funding on the educational programs, and examine the programs for educational accountability.

Education providers to pilot project facilities benefit from participation in four ways:

- They receive both the full base cost from the state and tuition from local districts;
- They receive the full base cost "up-front" from the $1 million set-aside;
- They receive assistance from ODE in getting tuition from local districts of residence; and
- They are allowed to bill for excess costs for special education students.

However, these providers receive less *state* funding for special education students because they do not receive the special education weighted amount. As a result, these costs are billed to districts of residence as excess costs, placing a greater burden on those districts.

Education standards

LOEO discovered that only the education programs in the five pilot project facilities, the 11 DYS school district facilities, and a limited number of county DYS facilities are held accountable using education standards. ODE monitors the education programs offered in pilot project facilities using criteria that address areas such as required teacher/student contact hours, proficiency testing, and Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) for students with special needs. The DYS school district facilities and some county DYS facilities undergo accreditation from the American Correctional Association. This accreditation requires the facilities to adhere to general standards for education programs, including an annual evaluation.

The remaining on-grounds education programs in over 100 facilities are not required to follow any education standards and are not monitored.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Evaluation of the pilot project

LOEO concludes that there is no "system" for funding education programs in residential facilities. The amount and flow of education funding to providers depends on a variety of ad hoc factors. The Private Treatment Facility Pilot Project included a funding mechanism that its developers hoped would expand to include all facilities in Ohio. Although ODE monitors the education programs in the five individual facilities, it has not done an overall evaluation of the effectiveness of the pilot project.

LOEO recommends that the Ohio Department of Education:

- Complete an evaluation of the pilot project for the purpose of making judgments about its effectiveness and whether the funding and monitoring processes should apply to all 167 residential facilities statewide.
- Inform the task force described in the following recommendation about what has been learned from the pilot project regarding the funding process and the incorporation of education standards that might benefit all residential facilities.

Task force on education funding for youth in residential facilities

When gathering information for this study, LOEO attempted to identify the number of residential facilities licensed or approved to operate in Ohio and the number of youth served by these facilities. LOEO learned that, although various state agencies maintain their own lists of the residential facilities that they license or approve, no unified list of these facilities exists. In addition, these state agencies do not collect essential data regarding the education programs and providers, the regular and special education students served, and the associated costs.

Without these data, LOEO was unable to determine the amount of funding education providers *should* receive to educate residential facility youth and could not estimate a statewide cost for these services.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LOEO recommends the Ohio General Assembly:

- Require that the Ohio Department of Education convene a task force to recommend a new education funding system for youth in residential facilities. This task force should include representatives from the Ohio Departments of Youth Services, Job and Family Services, Mental Health, and Alcohol and Drug Abuse Services, as well as juvenile courts, Family and Children First Councils, county children services agencies, and parents or guardians.

- First, this task force should develop a unified database of residential facilities serving youth in Ohio and determine the organization or individuals responsible for maintaining the database. The database should include, but not be limited to:

  - Contact information (e.g., facility name, director's name, address, and phone);
  - The number of students served within a given time period (e.g., six months or one year);
  - Who placed students in the facility;
  - Whether the facility has an education program provided on the premises;
  - Who provides education services to youth in the facility;
  - The number of days of instruction each student received during a given time period;
  - If a student receives special education services and, if so, for which disability; and
  - If a student is included in an ADM and, if so, of which district.

- Second, the task force should address how to capture the costs of educating residential facility students. Specifically, it should determine what revenue and expenditure data to include in the unified database.

- Third, the task force should project a statewide cost of educating regular and special education students in residential facilities and determine what state funding mechanism would be best for such a highly mobile student population. The task force should use the information learned from ODE's evaluation of the pilot project regarding the amount and flow of dollars to providers.

- Fourth, the task force should recommend that the General Assembly discontinue funding the pilot project after a new funding mechanism is in place.

- Fifth, the task force should consider whether education standards should be added to licensure requirements of agencies licensing residential facilities. These requirements might vary depending, for example, on the type of student served and the average length of stay.

Improving communication

LOEO learned that many residential facilities and education providers are either unaware or confused about available funding:

- Some private residential facility administrators seem unaware that there are a number of options for providing education programs to its students. Public school districts, for example, are not the only type of education provider.

- Some school district treasurers are unaware that Ohio law allows them to include residential facility students in their ADM. As a result, these school districts do not receive the average state base cost or the state share of the special education weighted amount for facility students.

- In fiscal year 2001, only two juvenile courts in Ohio took advantage of a $425,000 set-aside that can be used to help defray the education costs for youth placed by the court in private residential facilities.

LOEO recommends the Ohio Department of Education (ODE):

- Designate a contact person within ODE for education providers and residential facility staff members to learn about the options available for providing education services in schools on the premises.

- Be proactive in explaining the sources and amounts of public education funding available to education providers and how they can obtain that funding. For example, make education providers aware of how to include residential facility students in their ADM and how to calculate tuition and excess costs.

- Find ways to notify juvenile courts about the availability of the $425,000 set-aside for education services.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDICES

Appendix A
Residential Facilities
(N = 167)*

Residential Facility	City	County	Facility Type	Licensing Agency	Beds
Adams County DJFS	West Union	Adams	County DJFS	ODJFS	20
Adolescent Counseling and Treatment, Inc. (ACT 1, Inc.)	Akron	Summit	Private-Pilot	ODJFS	95
Adolf Frazier Treatment Home	Cincinnati	Hamilton	Private	ODJFS	10
Adriel School, Inc.	West Liberty	Champaign	Private	ODJFS	42
Allen Acres (Allen CCS)	Lima	Allen	Children Services Board	ODJFS	24
Allen County Juvenile Service Center	Lima	Allen	County DYS		20
Altercrest	Cincinnati	Hamilton	Private	ODJFS, ODMH	24
Ashland Detention Facility	Ashland	Ashland	County DYS		10
Ashtabula County Childrens Services Board	Ashtabula	Ashtabula	Children Services Board	ODJFS	25
Ashtabula County Youth Development Center	Ashtabula	Ashtabula	County DYS		21
Athens County Children's Services Board	Athens	Athens	Children Services Board	ODJFS	18
Avondale Youth Center	Zanesville	Muskingum	Children Services Board	ODJFS	22
Bassett House - Health Recovery Services, Inc.	Athens	Athens	Private	ODADAS	25
Beech Brook	Pepper Pike	Cuyahoga	Private	ODJFS, ODMH	40
Bellefaire/Jewish Children's Bureau (JCB)	Cleveland	Cuyahoga	Private	ODADAS, ODJFS, ODMH	101
Belmont-Harrison Juvenile District	St. Clairsville	Belmont	County DYS	ODJFS	20
Berea Children's Home and Family Services	Berea	Cuyahoga	Private	ODJFS, ODMH	48
BHC Belmont Pines Hospital, Inc.	Youngstown	Mahoning	Private	ODMH	18

* LOEO estimates that there are 167 residential facilities. Additional facilities may exist.

Abbreviations

ODJFS: *Ohio Department of Job and Family Services*
ODMH: *Ohio Department of Mental Health*
ODADAS: *Ohio Department of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Services*
County DYS: *County Department of Youth Services*
State DYS: *State Department of Youth Services*
County DJFS: *County Department of Job and Family Services*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Residential Facility	City	County	Facility Type	Licensing Agency	Beds
Boys' Village, Inc.	Smithville	Wayne	Private	ODADAS, ODJFS	87
Boys/Girls Home of Greater Cincinnati	Cincinnati	Hamilton	Private	ODJFS	24
Bridgeway Home, Inc.	Norton	Summit	Private	ODJFS	25
Buckeye Ranch	Grove City	Franklin	Private	ODJFS, ODMH	82
Buckhorn Children's Center of Ohio -	Chesterville	Morrow	Private	ODJFS	10
Bunker Hill Haven for Boys	Hamilton	Butler	Private	ODJFS	24
Butler County Juvenile Detention Center	Hamilton	Butler	County DYS		66
Butler County Juvenile Rehabilitation Center	Hamilton	Butler	County DYS		46
Canton Boys' Group Home	Canton	Stark	County DYS		11
Catholic Charities Services Corp./Parmadale	Cleveland	Cuyahoga	Private	ODJFS	112
Child and Adolescent Service Center	Canton	Stark	Private	ODJFS	12
Children's Aid Society	Cleveland	Cuyahoga	Private	ODJFS, ODMH	35
Children's Center of Ohio, Inc.	Kitts Hill	Lawrence	Private	ODJFS	12
Children's Comprehensive Services	Mansfield	Richland	Private	ODMH	26
Choices, Inc.	Dayton	Montgomery	Private	ODJFS	10
Christian Children's Home of Ohio, Inc.	Wooster	Wayne	Private	ODJFS	46
Circleview Juvenile Corrctional Facility	Circleview	Pickaway	State DYS		144
Clark County Children's Home	Springfield	Clark	County DJFS	ODJFS	24
Clark Juvenile Detention Center	Springfield	Clark	County DYS		29
Clear Creek Farm	Sidney	Shelby	Private	ODJFS	20
Clermont County Detention Center	Batavia	Clermont	County DYS		15
Cleveland Christian Home, Inc.	Cleveland	Cuyahoga	Private	ODJFS	56
Cornell Abraxas Group, Inc.	Shelby	Richland	Private-Pilot	ODADAS, ODJFS	108
Cuyahoga County Juvenile Detention Center	Cleveland	Cuyahoga	County DYS		86
Cuyahoga County Treas. Children's Aid Society	Cleveland	Cuyahoga	Private	ODMH	36
Cuyahoga Hills Juvenile Correctional Facility	Highland Hills	Cuyahoga	State DYS		200
David L. Brown Youth Center	Troy	Miami	County DYS		16
Daybreak	Dayton	Montgomery	Private	ODJFS	20

Residential Facility	City	County	Facility Type	Licensing Agency	Beds
Dennis J. Boll Group and Shelter Home	Ironton	Lawrence	County DYS		12
Dettmer Adolescent Residential Center	Troy	Miami	Private	ODMH	26
Dora Tate Youth Center	Dayton	Montgomery	County DYS		12
Down's Residence Hall	Mansfield	Richland	Children Services Board	ODJFS	20
Edward J. Ruzzo Juvenile Justice Center	Marion	Marion	County DYS		47
Elsass Team Center	North Canton	Stark	Private	ODJFS	20
Erie County Juvenile Detention Center	Sandusky	Erie	County DYS		14
Fairfield Academy	Thornville	Perry	Private	ODJFS, ODMH	24
Female Initiative for Rehabilitation and Skills Training (FIRST)	Mansfield	Richland	Private-Pilot	ODJFS	30
Five County Joint Juvenile Detention Center	Marysville	Union	County DYS		38
Fox Run Hosp. Res. TX Center	St. Clairsville	Belmont	Private	ODMH	41
Franklin County Juvenile Detention Center	Columbus	Franklin	County DYS		112
Freedom Center	Delaware	Delaware	State DYS		26
Friars Club, Inc.	Cincinnati	Hamilton	Private-Pilot	ODJFS	25
Gallia County Childrens Services	Gallipolis	Gallia	Children Services Board	ODJFS	18
Geauga County Youth Center	Chardon	Geauga	County DYS		16
Genesis Community Residential Center	Athens	Athens	County DYS		12
Green County Juvenile Detention Center	Xenia	Greene	County DYS		20
Greene County Residential Treatment	Xenia	Greene	County DYS		16
Guernsey County Children's Services Board	Cambridge	Guernsey	Children Services Board	ODJFS	12
Hamilton County Juvenile Detention Center	Cincinnati	Hamilton	County DYS		107
Hannah Neil Center for Children	Columbus	Franklin	Private	ODJFS	24
Hearne House, Inc.	Cincinnati	Hamilton	Private	ODJFS	43
Hillcrest Training School	Cincinnati	Hamilton	County DYS		130
Hocking Valley Community Residential Center	Nelsonville	Athens	County DYS	ODJFS	32
Indian River Juvenile Correctional Facility	Massillon	Stark	State DYS		192
Jefferson County Childrens Services Board	Stuebenville	Jefferson	Children Services Board	ODJFS	14
Jefferson County Juvenile Detention	Steubenville	Jefferson	County DYS		22

Residential Facility	City	County	Facility Type	Licensing Agency	Beds
Juvenile Residential Center of Northwest Ohio	Bowling Green	Wood	County DYS		42
K.E.L.L.Y. Youth Services, Inc.	Cincinnati	Hamilton	Private	ODJFS	25
Keller Hall Juvenile Center	Galion	Crawford	Children Services Board	ODJFS	10
Kettering Youth Services	Dayton	Montgomery	Private	ODMH	15
Lake County Youth Detention Center	Painesville	Lake	County DYS		40
Learning Appropriate Behaviors, Inc.	Cincinnati	Hamilton	Private	ODJFS	10
Lighthouse Residential Center	Cincinnati	Hamilton	Private	ODADAS, ODJFS	18
Lighthouse Youth Center - Paint Creek	Bainbridge	Ross	Private-Pilot	ODADAS, ODJFS	49
Lincoln Place Residential Center for Youth	Youngstown	Mahoning	Private	ODJFS	220
Lorain County Juvenile Detention Center/Domestic R. Court	Elyria	Lorain	County DYS	ODJFS	40
Louis Tobin Attention Center	Lisbon	Columbiana	County DYS		20
Lucas County Youth Treatment Center	Toledo	Lucas	County DYS		44
Lutheran Homes Society/Family & Youth Services, inc.	Toledo	Lucas	Private	ODJFS	44
Mahoning County Children Services Board	Youngstown	Mahoning	Children Services Board	ODJFS	30
Marion Juvenile Correctional Facility	Marion	Marion	State DYS		260
Marsh Foundation Home and School	Van Wert	Van Wert	Private	ODJFS	36
Martin P. Joyce Juvenile Detention Center	Youngstown	Mahoning	County DYS		40
Marycrest	Independence	Cuyahoga	Private	ODADAS, ODJFS	105
Maryhaven Youth Center	Lebanon	Warren	County DYS		36
Maryhaven, Inc. Adolescent Treatment Program	Columbus	Franklin	Private	ODADAS, ODMH	16
Maumee Juvenile Correctional Facility	Liberty Center	Henry	State DYS		120
Medina County Juvenile Detention Center	Medina	Medina	County DYS	ODJFS	10
Mid-Western Children's Home	Pleasant Plain	Warren	Private	ODJFS	36
Mohican Juvenile Correctional Facility	Loudonville	Ashland	State DYS		120
Montgomery County Juvenile Detention Center	Dayton	Montgomery	County DYS		59
Muskingum County Juvenile Detention Center	Zanesville	Muskingum	County DYS		14
New Directions	Cleveland	Cuyahoga	Private	ODADAS	16
New Horizon Youth Center	Bethesda	Belmont	Private	ODJFS, ODMH	18

Residential Facility	City	County	Facility Type	Licensing Agency	Beds
New Philadelphia Group Home	New Philadelphia	Tuscarawas	County DYS		11
Next Step, Inc. Group Home #2	Canton	Stark	Private	ODJFS	20
Nicholas Residential Treatment Center for Youth	Dayton	Montgomery	County DYS		24
North Central Ohio Rehabilitation Center	Marion	Marion	County DYS		20
Northeast Ohio Regional Center for Adolescent Treatment	Niles	Trumbull	Private	ODADAS	0
Northwest Ohio Juvenile Detention Center	Stryker	Williams	County DYS		32
Oak Ridge Treatment Center, Inc., - # 1	Pedro	Lawrence	Private	ODMH	65
Oakview Juvenile Rehabilitation Center	St. Clairsville	Belmont	County DYS	ODJFS	10
Oesterlen Services for Youth	Springfield	Clark	Private	ODJFS, ODMH	52
Ohio Boys Town, Inc.	Berea	Cuyahoga	Private	ODJFS	30
Ohio River Valley Juvenile Correctional Facility	Franklin Furnace	Scioto	State DYS		240
One Way Farm, Inc.	Fairfield	Butler	Private	ODJFS	20
Opportunity Center	Delaware	Delaware	State DYS		42
Options for Families and Youth	Brook Park	Cuyahoga	Private	ODADAS, ODJFS	10
Parmadale, Inc.	Parma	Cuyahoga	Private	ODJFS, ODMH	48
Pathway, Caring for Children	Columbus	Franklin	Private	ODJFS	11
Paulding County DJFS	Paulding	Paulding	County DJFS	ODJFS	10
Pemberville Boys Ranch	Pemberville	Wood	Private	ODJFS	18
Perry County Group Home	Crooksville	Perry	County DYS		10
Portage-Geauga County Juvenile Detention Center	Ravenna	Portage	County DYS		30
Preble County DJFS	Eaton	Preble	County DJFS	ODJFS	20
Richland County Attention Center	Mansfield	Richland	County DYS		20
Riverview Juvenile Correctional Facility	Delaware	Delaware	State DYS		144
Rogers Boys Group Home	Rogers	Columbiana	County DYS		14
Rosemont Center	Columbus	Franklin	Private	ODADAS, ODJFS	58
Ross County Juvenile Detention Center	Chillicothe	Ross	County DYS		19
Safely Home, Inc.	Bedford	Cuyahoga	Private	ODJFS	18
Sandusky County Juvenile Detention Center	Fremont	Sandusky	County DYS		19

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Residential Facility	City	County	Facility Type	Licensing Agency	Beds
Sargus Juvenile Detention Center	St Clairsville	Belmont	County DYS		20
Scioto County Detention Center	Portsmouth	Scioto	County DYS		24
Scioto Juvenile Correctional Facility	Delaware	Delaware	State DYS		192
Seneca County Youth Center	Tiffin	Seneca	County DYS		25
Shelter Care, Inc.	Akron	Summit	Private	ODJFS	42
Ship, Inc. (Lynn Way)	Canton	Stark	Private	ODJFS	10
St. Aloysius Orphanage	Cincinnati	Hamilton	Private	ODJFS	30
St. Anthony Villa - Andre Hall/Boysville	Toledo	Lucas	Private	ODADAS, ODJFS	75
St. Joseph Children's Treatment Center	Dayton	Montgomery	Private	ODJFS, ODMH	68
St. Joseph Orphanage	Cincinnati	Hamilton	Private	ODJFS	24
St. Vincent Family Centers	Columbus	Franklin	Private	ODMH	26
Stark County Attention Center	Canton	Stark	County DYS		35
Stark County Residential Treatment Center	Canton	Stark	County DYS		50
Starr Commonwealth	Van Wert	Van Wert	Private	ODJFS	93
Stepping Stone Rehabilitation Center	Elyria	Lorain	County DYS	ODJFS	20
Stevens House -House of Hope for Alcoholics	Columbus	Franklin	Private	ODADAS	16
Summit County DJFS	Akron	Summit	County DJFS	ODJFS	24
Summit County Juvenile Detention Services	Akron	Summit	County DYS		45
Syntaxis Youth Homes, Inc.	Columbus	Franklin	Private	ODADAS, ODJFS	50
Talbert House - Alternatives	Cincinnati	Hamilton	Private	ODADAS	26
Talbert House - Compass	Cincinnati	Hamilton	Private	ODMH	20
Talbert House - Passages	Cincinnati	Hamilton	Private	ODADAS	24
Talbert House - The Bridge	Cincinnati	Hamilton	Private	ODMH	16
Thompkins Adolescent Center	Cambridge	Guernsey	Private	ODMH	14
Trumbull County Childrens Services Board	Warren	Trumbull	Children Services Board	ODJFS	25
Trumbull County Juvenile Detention Center	Warren	Trumbull	County DYS		36
Tuscarawas Juvenile Attention Center	New Philadelphia	Tuscarawas	County DYS		20
United Methodist Children's Home	Worthington	Franklin	Private	ODJFS	77

Residential Facility	City	County	Facility Type	Licensing Agency	Beds
Vision for Youth, Inc.	Springfield	Clark	Private	ODJFS	25
Washington County Open Door Home	Marietta	Washington	County DYS		12
Wayne Holmes Attention Center	Wooster	Wayne	County DYS		20
West Central Juvenile Detention Facility	Troy	Miami	County DYS		42
West Central Juvenile Rehabilitation Facility	Troy	Miami	County DYS		36
Wood County Juvenile Detention Center	Bowling Green	Wood	County DYS		48
Youngstown Youth Academy	Youngstown	Mahoning	Private	ODJFS	30
Youth Development Center	Hudson	Summit	County DYS	ODJFS	130
Youth, Inc.	Cincinnati	Hamilton	Private	ODJFS	30
Total Bed Count					**7,078**

Appendix B
Map of Residential Facilities in Ohio

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix C
Education Program Criteria for Private Residential Treatment Facilities*

Administration and Management	YES	NO
1. Agencies must have the following in writing:	☐	☐
• a statement describing the philosophy and goals of the education program;	☐	☐
• policies and procedures for the operation of the educational services;	☐	☐
• an organizational chart;	☐	☐
• a plan for evaluation of educational services provided with a review schedule;	☐	☐
• a plan for quality enhancement or Continuous Quality Improvement.	☐	☐
2. Agencies must follow generally accepted accounting procedures and have records available for inspection for a period of up to seven years.	☐	☐
3. Agencies must have a line item budget for each educational program administered.	☐	☐
4. Each residential education program shall have a designated educator responsible for the instructional program, including the coordination and supervision of educational staff. The educational directors from each program shall meet at least quarterly to share ideas and concerns. A staff representative from the Ohio Department of Education shall be invited to the meetings.	☐	☐
5. Professional, specialized staff development shall be provided.	☐	☐

General Requirements	YES	NO
6. Adequate space, instructional materials, textbooks, technology and equipment must be provided:	☐	☐
• The program must be conducted in adequate space with equipment that meets state and federal standards and the objectives of the education program.	☐	☐
• The program must be supported by appropriate print and non-print instructional materials, media and library services.	☐	☐
7. The program must maintain average teacher/pupil ratios not to exceed 15 learners to 1 teacher. If a program has 11 to 15 learners per teacher, it is recommended that the teacher have an aide.	☐	☐
8. An extended school calendar of 230 days with 210 instructional days shall be provided.	☐	☐
9. Each program shall have an orientation program for new learners which provides information about the nature and requirements of the educational program and the learner's role in their education.	☐	☐

* Applies only to the five pilot project facilities

10. There will be written statements of expected, measurable performance outcomes in each subject area.	☐	☐
11. Educational services must be provided to all learners regardless of segregation from the regular population, disabilities or other special needs.	☐	☐
12. Parents, relatives, family friends, a representative of the custodial agency or home-school/county-based special advocates for the youth shall be invited to participate on an IEP team.	☐	☐
Educator Qualifications and Requirements	**YES**	**NO**
13. All educators must be licensed/certified by the Ohio Department of Education.	☐	☐
14. All educators must be evaluated in compliance with school district procedures.	☐	☐
15. The treatment director must interview prospective new teachers for the on-site school when a vacancy is filled. The program director will provide the local school district with interview results regarding the applicant's suitability for teaching in the agency school.	☐	☐
16. Educators must participate in education and treatment planning conferences and team meetings for youth they teach.	☐	☐
17. Each program shall have written policies and procedures for the selection, retention, evaluation and professional development of educational personnel on the basis of specified qualifications and state and federal law.	☐	☐
18. New education staff shall be provided with pre-service orientation and training in the procedures and principles of providing educational services to the specific population served.	☐	☐
Special Education	**YES**	**NO**
19. All youth determined to have educational disabilities shall have IEPs in compliance with applicable state and federal regulations as part of their written plans.	☐	☐
20. Special education services must be available to meet the needs of all learners with disabilities.	☐	☐
Proficiency Tests and Evaluation of Outcomes	**YES**	**NO**
21. Youth shall undergo the same proficiency tests as all other Ohio learners.	☐	☐
22. Results of these proficiency tests shall be forwarded to the Ohio Department of Education in accordance with state regulations.	☐	☐
Assessment	**YES**	**NO**
23. Youth shall begin receiving educational services within one week of placement in the facility.	☐	☐
24. There shall be a system for preliminary and full screening, assessment and evaluation to determine the educational needs of each learner and to assess progress.	☐	☐
25. A preliminary assessment shall be completed within four days of placement in the facility.	☐	☐

26. A full assessment shall be completed no later than thirty days after placement in the facility.	☐	☐
27. Learners shall be evaluated regularly regarding educational progress. Grades, credits, competencies, certificates and/or diplomas earned shall be clearly documented in writing.	☐	☐
28. Student progress and ongoing needs shall be reported to families, the custodial agency and the assigned caregivers for the youth.	☐	☐
Records and Transition	**YES**	**NO**
29. All relevant records (educational, medical, portfolio, service history) shall follow the youth to the placement setting and back home, to the receiving school and/or to the aftercare setting.	☐	☐
30. A written plan will be developed with guidelines for the development of a learner portfolio and educational, vocational and transitional objectives that relate to the education goals set for each youth.	☐	☐
31. Grade placement and units of credit shall be accepted for learners transferring from any school in Ohio which is in compliance with Chapter 3301-35 of the Administrative Code and from any out-of-state school approved by a state department of education or the equivalent for schools attended in a foreign country.	☐	☐
32. Credits earned from a pilot program school shall be accepted by any Ohio school a youth subsequently attends.	☐	☐
Content of Education	**YES**	**NO**
33. The course of instruction shall be responsive to the educational needs of youth who:	☐	☐
• were in school and making satisfactory progress before the placement began; or	☐	☐
• were at least 16 years of age, not in school and not likely to re-enter school upon return to the community; or	☐	☐
• have substantial deficits in reading and/or mathematics and very low motivation to continue education; or	☐	☐
• are entitled to a special education under federal and state laws.	☐	☐
• to the extent that youth with these characteristics are represented in the facility population, academic, GED, literacy/numeracy and special education programs shall be provided.	☐	☐
• independent living skills and employment readiness programs shall also be made available to youths who need them.	☐	☐
Behavior Management	**YES**	**NO**
34. Agencies must have a behavior management policy in writing that is consistent with all applicable state regulations. The policy must define the types of behavior interventions (including restraint or seclusion, if applicable) that are approved; who is authorized to use the interventions; and in what circumstances the interventions may be used.	☐	☐
• The training qualifications of staff who will be implementing restraint and/or seclusion interventions must be documented.	☐	☐

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").